

**REMARKS**

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated September 12, 2003, claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claims 1, 2, 14, and 21 stand objected to for several informalities. Applicants have amended the claims according to the Examiner's suggestions.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to remove "said high frequency signal" and replace it with the object detection signal. Applicants believe that this amendment overcomes this rejection.

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Lemelson* (5,983,161). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of operating a precrash sensing system that includes generating an object detection signal over a field of view from a first vehicle, receiving the object detection signal at the second vehicle when positioned within the field of view, generating a response signal in response to the object detection signal, said response signal including a key. The method further includes establishing a communication link between the first vehicle and the second vehicle using a key and communicating a first vehicle data signal to the second vehicle using said key and communicating a second vehicle data signal to the first vehicle using the key. Thus, a key is used for exchanging signals between the first vehicle and the second vehicle.

The key is obtained only when one vehicle is within the field of view of the other vehicle. As described in the specification in paragraph 45, this allows the vehicles to communicate using the key while vehicles not holding the key are excluded from communication. This prevents too much information being available to users such as described in the *Lemelson* reference. Thus, only when one vehicle is within the field of view of the other is a key exchanged. This is not taught or suggested in the *Lemelson* reference. Nor, does the *Lemelson* reference teach or suggest the use of a communication key. For a communication key, the Examiner points to Col. 18, lines 30-43. Lines 30-43 are directed to a system that describes using frequency division multiple access, time division multiple access, or code division multiple access in the communication between the two vehicles. However, no communication key is exchanged between the vehicles. Thus, it can only be presumed that the vehicles communicate with all of the other vehicles therearound. Therefore, the *Lemelson* reference does not teach or suggest the use of a communication key. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection.

Likewise, the above arguments also apply to claims 14 and 21 since each described the use of the key. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider these claims as well.

Likewise, claims 2-13, 15-20, and 22-23 are dependent and thus are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants submit that all rejections are now overcome. The applicants have added no new material to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance

and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Please charge any fees required in the filing of this amendment to Deposit Account 06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa  
Reg. No. 38,049  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500

Date: 12/12/03